

THE CHRISTIAN MAGAZINE.

BY MEMBERS OF MENDON ASSOCIATION.

VOL. III.

FEBRUARY, 1826.

No. 2.

CONTENTS.

On Divination	33	Deception or Hypocrisy in	
On the Perfect Knowledge of God	39	Death	59
The Criminality of Unbelief	43	A Question	60
A Faithful Exhibition of the Gos- pel, the occasion of divisions		A Request	60
among men	47	Missionary Intelligence	60
Thoughts on the Sabbath	51	Ordinations and Installations	63
		Poetry	64

CONDITIONS.

1. THE CHRISTIAN MAGAZINE shall contain 32 octavo pages, be executed as it respects type and paper in the style of the Christian Spectator, and afforded to subscribers at \$1,50 a volume, payable in advance ; or \$2 paid at the end of six months.

2. Those who become responsible for five copies shall receive the sixth gratis.

3. No subscriptions are to be taken for less than a year ; and if notice of discontinuance is not given before the issuing of the last number, subscribers will be considered as desiring it the succeeding year.

4. This volume shall be published in Boston ; and though it will contain no more pages, it shall comprise considerably more matter, than either of the preceding volumes.

N. B. All communications to this work are to be sent, *post paid*, to the Centre Post-Office in Wrentham, Mass., directed to the Editors of the Christian Magazine, or to the office of T. R. MARVIN, Congress-street, Boston, by whom it is to be printed.

Boston :

PRINTED BY T. R. MARVIN.

1826.

THE
CHRISTIAN MAGAZINE.

VOL. III.

FEBRUARY, 1826.

No. 2.

For the Christian Magazine.
ON DIVINATION.

THE inhabitants of New-England have been stigmatized for their superstition and credulity in respect to divination. But it ought to be known and remembered, that they were led into this delusion, by the opinion and practice of some of the most eminent civilians and divines in Britain. Divination, in various forms, prevailed *there*, before it prevailed *here*; and more persons were tried, condemned, and put to death for it *there*, than were ever tried, and punished for it *here*. It ill becomes Old-England to reproach New-England for following their own example. Both they and we undoubtedly acted without that coolness and deliberation, which was proper in a case so interesting to the characters and lives of men. The proper time, therefore, in which to form our opinions upon this subject, is when there is no appearance of the crime, and the characters and lives of men are not in jeopardy. And since such is the present time, it may not be deemed altogether improper or useless, to discuss the subject of divination and endeavour to gain all the light we can concerning it, by means of time, observation, scripture, and reason. In order to treat it with propriety and perspicuity, I shall

VOL. III.

5

consider the origin, the nature, and the evil, of Divination.

1. The origin of Divination.

This practice is of great antiquity. It prevailed soon after the destruction of the old world. As soon as mankind were dispersed by the confusion of languages, it spread among the principal nations of the earth. It was early practised in Chaldea and Babylon and Egypt, where we find magicians and astrologers; and among the Canaanites we find Balaam, who used divination and enchantments against Israel. This evil practice originated from a religious source. The true religion was revealed before any false religion existed, and all false religion is but a corruption of the true. Immediately after the apostacy of Adam, God appointed religious rites and ceremonies, which all the pious patriarchs observed, and handed down from generation to generation, by *tradition* and *example* only, until a written revelation was given by the hand of Moses. But both these modes of maintaining and spreading religion in the world could be easily and early corrupted. Accordingly we find this was the truth of fact. The heathen nations liked not to retain God in their knowledge; but soon forsook his religious ordinances, and followed their own evil imagina-

tions and inventions. They either totally neglected, or varied, or disfigured the religious rites, which had been conveyed to them by the example and tradition of their pious progenitors. So that all their false religions, and rites, and ceremonies, were but corruptions and perversions of the true. But notwithstanding the general declension and corruption of religion after the flood, God had some sincere friends and faithful servants, with whom he meant to hold a friendly intercourse; and appointed certain means or modes of their seeking and obtaining the knowledge of his mind and will, respecting not only their duty, but *future events*. As soon, however, as God called Abraham from Ur of the Chaldees, and entered into covenant with him, and engaged to be his God and the God of his seed, he gave up the heathens to walk in their own ways, and confined his friendly intercourse to Abraham and his family until the law given by Moses. The heathen were now in a deplorable situation; for the true God had forsaken them, and they could not *themselves* look into futurity, and discover what changes and events would take place in time to come. Their curiosity and anxiety to know futurity, led them to the practice of *Divination*, or the use of certain modes and ceremonies of consulting their false divinities. They resolved to discover the unrevealed purposes of the true God, by some means or other; and if they could not discover future events by lawful means, they resolved to employ unlawful means; and if one method would not answer, they determined to try another. and another, until they were satisfied that they had gained their point. They

knew that the seed of Abraham had obtained the knowledge of the mind and will of their God, by various rites and ceremonies, and they determined to obtain the knowledge of the mind and will of their gods, by some such, or different rites and ceremonies. From this religious source, it is pretty evident, originated divination in all its various, foolish, and pernicious forms. An undue curiosity to know futurity, led mankind to use undue methods to discover it.

2. The nature of Divination.

There is no need of being a magician, or diviner, in order to discover this mystery of iniquity. The Bible, I am persuaded, will give us a true and clear knowledge of the nature of divination. This practice, we have just observed, probably took its rise from those divinely instituted modes, by which God allowed good men to converse with him, and learn his mind and will. Divination, therefore, consisted in doing something, which more or less resembled the *modes*, by which good men inquired of God, and were enabled to foretell future events. We find these modes expressly mentioned in several instances. Jonathan was a good man, and in a certain critical situation, he wished to know the will of God respecting his duty, and he took the following method to obtain it. "It came to pass upon a certain day, that Jonathan the son of Saul said unto the young man that bare his armour, Come, and let us go over to the Philistines' garrison that is on the other side. But he told not his father. And Jonathan said unto the young man that bore his armour, Come, and let us go over unto the garrison of these uncircumcised; it may be that the

Lord will work for us: for there is no restraint to the Lord to save by many or by few. And his armour-bearer said unto him, Do all that is in thine heart: turn thee; behold, I am with thee according to thy heart. Then said Jonathan, Behold, we will pass over unto these men, and we will discover ourselves unto them. *If they say unto us, Tarry, until we come to you; then we will stand still in our place, and will not go up unto them. But if they say thus, Come up unto us; then we will go up: for the Lord hath delivered them into our hand: and this shall be a sign unto us.* And both of them discovered themselves unto the garrison of the Philistines: and the Philistines said, Behold the Hebrews come forth out of the holes where they had hid themselves. And the men of the garrison answered Jonathan and his armour-bearer, and said, *Come up to us, and we will show you a thing.* And Jonathan said unto his armour-bearer, *Come up after me; for the Lord hath delivered them into the hand of Israel.* They went up and succeeded. Thus Jonathan made his own signs, by which he discovered the will of God in respect to his present duty. Gideon consulted God on a similar occasion, and discovered the will of God in the same way. "Gideon said unto God, If thou wilt save Israel by mine hand, as thou hast said, Behold, I will put a fleece of wool in the floor; and if the dew be on the fleece only, and it be dry upon all the earth beside, then shall I know that thou wilt save Israel by mine hand, as thou hast said. *And it was so:* for he rose up early on the morrow, and thrust the fleece together, and wringed the dew out of the fleece, a bowl-full of water.

And Gideon said unto God, Let not thine anger be hot against me, and I will speak but this once: let it now be dry only upon the fleece, and upon all the ground let there be dew. *And God did so that night:* for it was dry upon the fleece only, and there was dew on all the ground." Thus Gideon also made his own signs, and determined his duty according as God ordered those signs to happen. This, then, we are sure was one method, which God allowed his true friends and worshippers to take, in order to discover his will concerning duty and future events. Now, it is plain from Scripture, that divination consisted, in making certain arbitrary signs, in order to discover men's duty and fortune. And the different species of divination were only different signs to come at the same object. There was a great diversity of diviners and divinations forbidden by the law of Moses. "There shall not be found among you any one—that useth divination, or an observer of times, or an enchanter, or a witch, or a charmer, or a consulter with familiar spirits, or a wizard, or a necromancer." After Moses had forbidden these species of divination, as abominations which the heathens had practised, he proceeded to promise a Prophet to Israel, who should reveal all that they could have occasion to know. "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet, from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him shall ye hearken." This seems to imply, that all kinds of divination were designed to discover things unknown and future; and that the various methods to reach this end, made all the difference between a diviner, a magician, an observer of times, an

enchanter, a witch, a charmer, a consulter with familiar spirits, a wizard, a necromancer, a soothsayer, or astrologer. All these sorts of persons were only diviners or fortune tellers, who used different signs to gain their pretended knowledge. They all made their own signs, or employed their own peculiar methods, to extort the knowledge of futurity from him whom they considered as the great and invisible disposer of events. Accordingly, all their signs were of the same nature; that is, the nature of a lot. All their signs referred the matter sought, to the knowledge and disposal of some invisible agent. This is the nature of a lot. Solomon says, "the lot is cast into the lap; but the whole disposing thereof is of the Lord."

But that divination consisted in making *certain arbitrary signs*, in imitation of the mode which God allowed his friends to use, in order to learn his will, may clearly appear, if we only consider distinctly, some of the different modes of ancient divination. Let us begin with a diviner. Such was the king of Babylon. He used what was called the divination of the *staff* or *arrow*. We are told, "the king of Babylon stood at the parting of the way, at the head of the two ways, to use divination: he made his arrows bright." The meaning seems to be this: Nebuchadnezzar came to a place where two ways met, one led to the city Rabbath, and the other to Jerusalem; and in order to determine which of these cities he should attack first, he had recourse to this method. He wrote the names of the two cities upon several arrows, which were mixed together promiscuously in a quiver; and a boy, who was unacquainted

with the matter, drew out one, and the name of Jerusalem being upon it, the king was determined to lead his army towards that city. Others suppose the manner of this consultation was thus: the consulter measured his staff by spans, or by the length of his finger; saying as he measured, I will go, I will not go; I will do such a thing, I will not do it; and as the last span fell out, so he determined. This construction seems to be referred to by the prophet Hosea, where he says, "My people ask counsel of the *stocks*, and their *staff* declareth unto them." In this mode of divination it appears, that the whole art consisted in making certain arbitrary signs, which referred the object sought, to the disposal of some invisible hand.

The king of Babylon used two other modes of divination. It is said, "He made bright his arrows, he consulted *images*, he looked into the *liver*." These images are supposed to be the *Tera-phim*, or the same as the old Romans' household gods. How he consulted these we have no account. But his divination by looking into the liver is easy to understand. "To divine by the entrails was a practice generally adopted among the heathens; and because the liver was the principal member inspected, it was called consultation with the liver. In this kind of divination there were chiefly observed the colour of the entrails, their place, whether none were displaced, and the number, whether none were wanting, and the want of the liver was always understood to pre-*sage* the greatest misfortunes." This mode of divination wholly consisted in making arbitrary signs, and interpreting them in an arbitrary manner.

The Jews divined by Bath Kol. The mode was this. "The next words which they heard the next person speak that they met with, they called a voice from heaven, because thereby they thought the judgment of heaven to be declared, as to any dubious point, and the decrees of heaven to be revealed concerning the future success of any matter, which they wished to be informed of." This divination consisted in making and construing arbitrary signs. So did divination by books. Both Heathens and Christians practised this mode of divination; which was as follows. They opened a certain book, and the first words that turned up to view were the Oracle. The Christians used the Bible, for the same purpose, and in the same manner. Prideaux relates this anecdote. "On the consecration of William, the second Norman Bishop of the diocese of Norwich, the words which the Bible first opened at for him were *Nonhunc, sed Barrabam*, that is, not this man, but Barrabas; by which they made a judgment that this Bishop was not long to continue, and that a thief should come in his place; and so it accordingly happened." This mode of divination has been practised by modern as well as by ancient Christians. The writer of the life Mr. Wesley, the Father of the Westleyan Methodists, says, that he not only once or twice, but habitually used this mode of divination, to discover his duty. He determined the great question, whether he should be a *Calvinist*, or an *Armenian*, by casting a lot. And he frequently determined his duty in doubtful cases, by the words at which his Bible first turned up to view. And a great many professors of religion, as well as others, have gone, and

still go, into the same practice of divination by the Bible. In this way likewise some determine whether they have met with a saving change. If the first words they meet with, in opening the Bible happen to be these: "Thy sins are forgiven thee," they conclude it is a divine declaration of their good estate. Another way of divination was by birds. This may be illustrated by a story Hecateus tells us. "As I was travelling towards the Red Sea, there was in the company with us a certain Jew Mosollam, who excelled in archery. As several of us were travelling together, a certain sooth-sayer, who took upon him to fortel the fortune of our journey, bade all of us stand still, and we did so. Whereon this Jew asked us, what we stood for? Look ye, answered the cunning man, and showed him a bird. If that bird *stands*, said he, ye are to stand; *and if it rises and flies on*, ye are to go forward too; but if the bird *takes its flight the contrary way*, you must all go back again. The Jew hereat, without a word speaking, let fly an arrow, and killed the bird. This displeased the diviner and some of the company. Why certainly, said the Jew to them, are ye not all mad to make such a bustle about a foolish bird? How could that poor, wretched creature pretend to foreshow our fortune, that knew nothing of its own?" This divination consisted in arbitrary signs, arbitrarily construed. An observer of times divined in the same manner; he fixed on certain days or hours as fortunate, and on other certain days or hours as unfortunate; and pretended to foretell good or evil, by his own arbitrary signs. But it is needless to consider all the different modes of divination, if we

had time and knowledge sufficient. It appears from all the modes of divination which have been mentioned, that they are all of the same nature, and consist in making and interpreting arbitrary signs. And no diviner ever had power to do any more than this. Hence Cicero said, he wondered how any two soothsayers could look one another in the face, without smiling, because they knew each other to be impostors.

3. The evil of Divination.

That it is evil, God has assured us in his word. Diviners of every sort, are represented, both in the Old and New Testament, as vile and criminal characters, and severe punishments are denounced against them. Indeed, divination was a capital crime in Israel. None who practised this art were allowed to live, but expressly condemned to die. But why? Wherin did the criminality of divination consist? This is the question we are now to consider. And in considering it, we ought to make a distinction between the Jews and Heathens. Divination was less criminal in the latter, than in the former; but in both, altogether inexcusable. For,

1. It manifested too great a curiosity to know what God had a right to conceal. "Secret things, says Moses, belong unto the Lord our God; but those things that are revealed belong to us and to our children." Men have no right to pry into the secrets of divine providence. They ought not to be anxious about to-morrow; but ought to be entirely satisfied to know that their times are in the hands of God. But it is the design of divination to discover and defeat the counsels of heaven. It is, therefore, in its own nature a presumptuous tempting of provi-

dence. And in this its criminality partly consists. For were this all it implied, it would be criminal, and deserve the divine displeasure. And on this account it was very sinful in the heathens as well as Jews.

2. Divination had a tendency to lead men away from the path of duty, and to involve them in error and danger. By supposing they knew what they did not know, they were led to believe what they had no right to believe, and to do what they had no right to do. Divination, being an error, had a tendency to plunge them into other great and dangerous errors and delusions. And on this ground, it always was and always will be, extremely criminal. I must add,

3. That among the Jews, divination was not only disobedience to the divine law, but rebellion against the divine government. As a transgression of the law, it was disobedience; and as a withdrawalment of their allegiance to the God of Israel, it was real rebellion. Hence it is said, that "rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft," which implies that witchcraft is rebellion. Indeed, God expressly declared, that he viewed divination as a departure from him, and rebellion against him. Ahaziah was guilty of rebellion, in applying to divination to know whether his life should be preserved. He met with a fall and was sick in Samaria; "and he sent messengers, and said unto them, go, and inquire of Baal-zebub the god of Ekron, whether I shall recover of this disease. But the angel of the Lord said to Elijah the Tishbite, Arise, go up to meet the messengers of the King of Samaria, and say unto them, Is it because there is not a God in Israel, that ye go

to inquire of Baal-zebub the god of Ekron?" The language of Ahaziah's conduct was, that there was no God in Israel; which amounted to the sin of rebellion against the God of Israel. God also intimated to Isaiah, that those who should apply to diviners to discover the secrets of futurity, would cast off their allegiance to him. "And when they shall say unto you, Seek unto them that have familiar spirits, and unto wizards, that peep and that mutter: should not a people seek unto their God?" When any among the Jews either practised divination, or applied to diviners to know futurity, they acted as rebels against their God and King. For it was a practical renunciation of their allegiance to Jehovah, their rightful lawgiver and Judge. And if the heathens meant by divination, to apply to evil spirits for aid and assistance, they also rebelled against their own gods and their own government. So that divination in every point of view, was an evil, and, in some respects and under some circumstances, was extremely criminal, and deserved to be treated as a capital crime, like treason and rebellion.

[To be continued.]

For the Christian Magazine.

ON THE PERFECT KNOWLEDGE OF GOD.

IN this paper I shall attempt to illustrate the perfect knowledge of God, by showing in what it consists, or what it must imply.

1. Perfect knowledge, must include the knowledge of all existences. Unless God knows all that has existed, and all that does and will exist, he cannot be perfect in knowledge. If there is any

being, or thing, unknown to God, his knowledge would be limited and finite. He must perfectly know himself. He must know his own nature, and in what respects it differs from all other natures, and the mode and manner of his own existence and all his perfections. All the worlds that have been, or can be formed, with all that composes and inhabits them, must be objects of Divine knowledge. God must know every creature from insect to angel, all the unnumbered orders of creatures, with all the individuals that compose them, and all their properties, powers and conditions. The whole of being, however diversified or modified, whether of matter, or spirit, or of both, must be known by him. All this is evident, not only from the consideration of what must be included in perfect knowledge, but from other considerations. He must know all that he himself does. He is the Creator of all things. Without him was not any thing made, that is made. Nothing has existed, or does, or will exist, independently of his will and power. No forms of matter, or of life, can come into being without his pleasure and agency. The Bible ascribes unto God the knowledge of all his works. "Known unto God are all his works, from the beginning of the world. He looketh unto the ends of the earth, and seeth under the whole heaven. Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his sight."

2. In perfect knowledge are included not only all actual, but all possible existences. It would be absurd to suppose that real existences are all that possibly could exist. Other worlds and other creatures, other properties and forms of matter and of spirit were within the compass of pos-

sibility. Other things than those which do or ever will exist, might have been contrived and formed. What *is*, does not comprise all that might *possibly be*. God has not done all that he was able to do in creating. We can see that Almighty power might have produced more and different things, than those it actually has produced. God's power has been limited in its exercise, by his will, or pleasure, and not by impossibilities. He could have done otherwise, had it been his choice. In order to be perfect in knowledge, God must know all that it is possible could exist.

3. God must know the present system of things in all its operations, and in its particular and general results. There is a vast system of things. Relation, dependence and connexion subsist through the whole. The laws of matter and of mind are in constant operation, and are producing effects. Throughout material bodies there is motion, and among all intelligent natures, there are thought and action. We can trace the *immediate* effects and results, comparatively of but a few things, and the ultimate results of nothing. But we are of yesterday. Our knowledge is imperfect. God sees the *end* from the beginning. He looks through the whole of things, and sees them in all their intermediate causes and effects, in all their relations and dependencies, and well understands what will be the final result of that plan of things which he has adopted. If there is any motion, or event, if there is any influence, or effect, in any part of the system unknown to God; or if he is at a loss what will be the grand and final result of the whole of things, his knowledge is imperfect. Considering

the goodness of God, we must believe that he would not have brought any thing into existence, concerning which he did not know what would be its tendency and its whole effect. Let it be remembered too, that God governs all things; he must, therefore, know in respect to all that he governs. He must be fully acquainted with the reasons of all and of every part of his own conduct. Though clouds and darkness are round about his throne in respect to us, yet it is not so in respect to himself.

4. To be perfect in knowledge, God must know what would have been the result of any different system of things. The present system was not the only one possible with God. He might have varied his present plan, in a countless number of respects. He might have formed one essentially and, perhaps, entirely different. The present is not a plan of necessity, but of choice. Because the present plan was possible, we are not to suppose that any other was impossible. It is not to my purpose here, to inquire whether this is the best plan; but to state, that others were possible, and if God had seen fit, he might have chosen some other. The natures, the properties, and the arrangement of things, might have been different from what they are. Before creation, the present system of things was possible, but it did not actually exist. So there were other possible systems which might have been brought into real existence; but they were not chosen. Now, in order to be perfect in knowledge, God must know all these, in all their operations and effects, and see what would be their respective and final results. If he does not,

he cannot be certain that the present system is not less wise than some other, and of consequence, it does not fully gratify his infinite benevolence.

5. To be perfect in knowledge, God must know, not only all the motions in all the inanimate parts of nature, but the thoughts, intentions, motives, and actions, of all his intelligent creatures. He must know them individually, and all that they think, intend and do, and be acquainted with all the principles and motives of their conduct. Their hearts and lives must all be open to his inspection. To us there is an inconceivable amount of intellectual and moral exercises put forth every moment in the universe of creatures. We know but a few of them, besides those of our own; but God must know them singly, through the whole intelligent creation. There cannot be a thought, or a purpose, or an act, pertaining to any being throughout all his immense works, unknown to him. If there is, his knowledge, like our own, would be imperfect. Not a single mental, or moral exercise, since the existence of an intelligent creature, is forgotten before God. All the past is the object of his present knowledge. Nor is there a future thought, exercise or action, less known to him than those of the present, or past. To suppose otherwise, would imply imperfection in divine knowledge, and would be to append some portion of ignorance to a being of infinite intelligence. The scriptures confirm what has been stated under this article. "The Lord is a God of knowledge; by him actions are weighed. I am He, and there is none else, declaring the *end* from the beginning, and from ancient times, the things which are not

yet done. His eyes are upon the ways of man, and he seeth all his goings. The Lord searcheth all hearts and understandeth all the imaginations of the thoughts. I know the things that come into your minds, every one of you. I know thy works, and charity, and service, and faith, and patience. Mine eyes are upon all their ways; neither is their iniquity hid from me."

6. Perfect knowledge, in God, includes that of the present *character* and *condition* of all his intelligent creatures. His knowledge of their character appears from what has already been proved. For if he knows all their hearts and all their conduct, he must know their true character. Their moral exercises and actions constitute, and cannot but constitute, their moral character. He cannot be, in the least degree, ignorant of the moral turpitude and moral excellence of any intelligent creature throughout his extended dominions. He knows the depravity and guilt of fallen angels and of fallen men. He knows the degree of holiness and of sin in the renewed on earth, and the degree of holiness in every glorified saint and in every angel of light. He knows the *past*, as well as the *present*, character of every moral being. If we should believe that he does not, we should not believe that he is perfect in knowledge. And he has as clear a view of his own character, as of the character of any of his intelligent creatures. Whilst God knows the character, he knows, also, the *condition* of every being that exists. He knows in what state all beings are, and what each enjoys or suffers in every part of creation. His infinite mind contemplates every part, and the whole amount of

suffering amongst all the creatures of his power. To him are known the pains and sorrows of his saints, and the sufferings of his enemies. Advert to what part of the universe you may, or to what individual you choose, God is a witness of every pain and of every joy that is felt. He knows what has been, as well as what is, and can tell, in every instance, what has been suffered and enjoyed, and what has been the cause of good and of evil. Concerning his people, God says, in his word, In all their afflictions, he was afflicted, and that they who touch them, touch the apple of his eye, and that he has a bottle for their tears. Your heavenly Father knoweth what things ye have need of, before you ask him. Respecting others, it is said, he does not afflict willingly, nor grieve the children of men, and that he hears the sighing of the prisoner, and the groans of them who are appointed to die. These and similar passages imply God's knowledge of the particular condition of his creatures.

7. The knowledge of God cannot be perfect, unless he knows the future character and condition of all intelligent beings that do and will exist. The truth of this must be apparent upon the slightest reflection. His knowledge of the present and past character and condition of all rational natures might be complete and entire; and yet if he does not know what these will be in future, there must be a great defect in his knowledge. It could not, in truth, be declared to be perfect. He would not see the end from the beginning. When it is once admitted, that God is perfect in knowledge, it cannot fairly be denied, that he must know what character all his intelligent and

moral creatures will form, and what will be their respective conditions in all future duration. To deny that he knows what these will be, is virtually to deny his omniscience, and of consequence, that he is perfect and is God. But who is prepared for such a denial, and thus to disallow to God, the glory that is due to his name? He has revealed himself as Omniscient, and as one to whom all things are known. "His understanding is infinite. God knoweth all things. Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world. Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his sight; but all things are naked and opened to the eyes of him with whom we have to do. Secret things belong unto the Lord our God." These passages assert and imply the omniscience of God, and virtually teach, that he knows the future character and condition of all intelligent creatures. From the particulars which have been stated and illustrated, it appears that the knowledge of God is perfect.

The reader will make his own reflections on the subject of this paper; but there is one which, probably, will not fail of being suggested to his mind.—It is this, that since God is perfect in knowledge, he is able, in any case, to determine what to do at one time, as well as at another. In numerous instances men are not. They have to wait for occurrences and for further knowledge. They can with no certainty determine what will be the course of events and the result of things. They have often to change their plans and their measures. As things proceed, their views alter, and they vary their determinations. It is not so with God. He has ever had all the knowledge that

he will ever possess, and all that is requisite to form his purpose concerning any being or event. He can determine as justly and as wisely at one time as at another. In itself considered, the difference is nothing, whether he decide what to do at the time of acting, or in any point of preceding duration. His conduct would be the same, and the event the same. Nothing is gained by supposing that God has no purposes respecting his own conduct previously to the time of his acting, if we allow that he does not act without designing to act.

MINORIS.

For the Christian Magazine.

THE CRIMINALITY OF UNBELIEF.

It is a criminal thing to disbelieve what God has spoken. One fact is sufficient to support this assertion, and that is this: unbelief is condemned in the scriptures. The Israelites were censured for not believing the divine declarations respecting the promised land, and for their consequent refusal to go, at the command of God, to take possession of it. "And the Lord said unto Moses, how long will this people provoke me? and how long will it be ere they *believe* me, for all the signs which I have showed among them? I will smite them with the pestilence, and disinherit them."

Moses and Aaron were censured for their unbelief at the time when water was brought from the rock to allay the thirst of the people. "And the Lord spake unto Moses and Aaron, because ye *believed me not* to sanctify me in the eyes of the children of Israel, therefore ye shall not bring this congregation into the land which I have given them."

In the New Testament, unbelief is censured in terms equally strong and decisive. "He that believeth not, is condemned already, because he hath not believed on the name of the only begotten Son of God. He that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." "If ye believe not that I am he," says the Saviour, "ye shall die in your sins."

Nothing can be more evident to every attentive reader, than that unbelief is condemned in all of the passages here quoted. If mankind are not criminal for their unbelief, it is impossible, I apprehend, to give any rational interpretation of these passages.

But here I shall be told, "that mankind always form their opinions in view of the evidence which is before them; that when they perceive evidence that any declaration is true they cannot help believing it; and that when they have not sufficient evidence of its truth, they cannot believe it, even if they would. As, therefore, they cannot control their opinions, it is unjust to censure them either for their belief, or unbelief." To all this, the fact, that God does censure those who disbelieve his declarations, is a sufficient reply. This fact, if we are satisfied of his goodness, is a conclusive argument that they are criminal, whether we are able to see the propriety of their being so considered or not. But we are not left in the dark on this subject. We are able, not only to ascertain as we have done the fact, that they are considered as criminal for their unbelief, but to see clearly the propriety of their being so considered. This is made evident, in the *first* place, from the fact, That

what God requires mankind to believe, is accompanied with sufficient evidence of its truth. God has never required any of his creatures to believe, without evidence to support their faith. His promise to the Israelites, that they should inherit the land of Canaan, was accompanied with sufficient evidence that it would be fulfilled. His oath on this subject was ample evidence. But as though this was not sufficient—as though they might doubt his ability, even when they were convinced of the sincerity of his intention to put them in possession of their inheritance, he followed his declaration with a series of miracles. The judgments which he brought upon Egypt for their sakes, their miraculous passage through the Red Sea, and their supply of bread and meat from heaven, fully evinced not only his purpose, but his ability, to perform his promise. The unbelief of this people, therefore, did not owe its existence to any want of evidence.

Christ did not require the Jews to believe that he was the Son of God, without evidence to support this claim. He showed them that the prophecies respecting the Messiah were fulfilled in him. He wrought a great variety of miracles, such as healing the sick, raising the dead, and casting out devils, to prove his mission from heaven. They did not disbelieve him because they had no evidence that he was the Son of God, but in opposition to all the evidence which was necessary to place this fact beyond a question.

Mankind are not now required to believe any thing without evidence of its truth. The divine authority of the scriptures is supported by the same prophecies and miracles, in connexion with

numerous others, by which Christ proved himself to be the promised Messiah. What is said in the scriptures in regard to the character of God, the character and work of Christ, the character and state of man:—what is said in regard to the conditions of salvation, the existence of the soul after death, the resurrection of the body, a day of judgment, and future rewards and punishments, is in very plain, and unequivocal language. The declarations of Jehovah upon these practical and important subjects are not difficult to be understood. To suppose that he has given a revelation upon these subjects which his creatures cannot understand, is absurd. This is to suppose that he has, in fact, given them no revelation at all. If we admit that God has said any thing upon these important subjects, for the benefit of his creatures, we must admit that what he has said may be understood. There is evidence on all these, and indeed, upon every other important practical subject, sufficient to lead all, who attend to it as they ought, to a reception of the truth. Those, therefore, who reject the truth, do this, not by regarding the light of evidence, but by resisting it. But who will deny, that in resisting the light of evidence, there is criminality? Or who will hesitate to affirm, that all the unbelief, which is the consequence of such resistance, is sin?

2. Unbelief is often the consequence of neglecting the study of the scriptures. The proper means of ascertaining what God has said, is the study of his word. By studying this, and attending to the fulfilment of the prophecies which it contains, and the other evidence of its divine origin,

which will naturally come in their way, individuals may become satisfied that it is the word of God, and the only infallible guide of their faith and practice. By studying the doctrines and precepts which it contains, they may satisfy themselves in regard to what God has, and has not revealed. But there are many who disbelieve what God has said, who do not study the scriptures. They do not consult them to know whether mankind in their natural state are wholly sinful, or not;—whether they must be renewed in the spirit of their minds, or not;—whether salvation is wholly by the grace of God through Jesus Christ, or not;—whether the righteous will be forever happy, and the wicked forever miserable in a future state, or not; or whether God, as a Being of infinite wisdom, power, and goodness, works all things after the counsel of his own will, or not. Some are so indifferent to the subject of religion as not to exercise their minds at all on questions like these. And many who do occasionally think and speak on these subjects, form their opinions much more from the conversation of others, and from their own unassisted reflections, guided by a dark understanding and a depraved heart, than from the study of the Bible. Now is it not evident, that those who disbelieve the declarations of God, in consequence of not studying his word, the appointed means of knowledge upon all subjects of religion, are criminal for their unbelief? What if they do not perceive evidence of the truth of this or that doctrine, or precept, which God has revealed? Can this circumstance excuse their unbelief, when they have ample evidence within their

reach, and might examine it to their satisfaction? Certainly not. If in this case, they are so ignorant of the will of God as to reject it, they are criminal for their ignorance, and accountable for all the unbelief which is its necessary consequence.

3. Many disbelieve what God has said in consequence of not studying his word with a due degree of attention and constancy. This class do occasionally study the word of God; but they study it very unfrequently, and with a great degree of listlessness and inattention. They do not half so frequently take the Bible into their hands, as they do other books of infinitely less importance. And when they do look into this, they do not peruse it with any thing like the attention which they give to other books. They read the Bible, not with a determination to understand it, but, perhaps, to quiet conscience, which will not allow the total neglect of it; or to keep up the appearance of religion, which is deemed of importance by those among whom they live; or to find arguments to support a favorite hypothesis which they feel an interest in defending. Now although the will of God is very plainly revealed in the scriptures; yet we cannot expect that it will be known by those who indulge themselves in this state of carelessness and inattention. God did not give his word to be an infallible guide to those who will not peruse it; nor to those who will not peruse it with attention and constancy. It cannot be expected that persons of this description will know and receive the truth. They will doubtless reject it. And if they are criminal for their neglect of the scriptures, they must also be for that

unbelief which a due attention to them would have prevented.

4. A heart opposed to the truth, is another reason why so many disbelieve what God has spoken. The truth upon the subject of religion is disagreeable to sinners. This the Saviour asserts in language too plain to be misunderstood. "And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil. For every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be re-proved." Mankind in their natural state are all sinners. They, therefore, naturally hate the holiness of God, because this condemns them. Conscious that they are sinners, and disposed to continue in their sins, they naturally hate the character, law, and government of God, because these are all holy. For the same reason they hate the *truths*, which *relate* to the character, law, and government of God. Conscious that they are sinners, and disposed to continue in sin, they hate Christ because he, as a Saviour, brings their sins to light, and exhibits them to the universe in all their native deformity. For the same reason, they hate the whole plan of redemption which he is engaged in accomplishing. This, not only makes manifest their sins, but calls upon them in the most affecting and solemn manner to forsake them. They hate the truth respecting the judgment-day, and the retributions of eternity, because in these they see the disgrace and ruin which nothing but repentance can prevent.

Now this opposition of heart to what God has spoken, does more than any thing else to keep them

in unbelief. Although it cannot influence them to disbelieve the truth, when all the evidence of it is before them; yet it can, and does influence them to turn away their attention from this evidence, so as not to feel its force. It influences them to seek after arguments in opposition to the truth, and prevents that patient, candid and impartial investigation of subjects, without which the truth can never be fully known. But can mankind be excusable for their unbelief, when it is the result of opposition to what is revealed? As opposition to the truth, which God has revealed, is itself criminal, all the unbelief which results from this must also be criminal.

5. Mankind are often led to disbelieve what God has spoken, in consequence of listening to those who contradict his declarations. The Israelites believed that the land of Canaan was a good land,—a "land that flowed with milk and honey," agreeably to the divine declaration, until ten of those who were sent to search it out, brought up an evil report respecting it. In consequence of listening to the false representations of these spies, the body of the people distrusted the word of God, and believed that the land was not worth possessing; or however valuable when possessed, it was absolutely beyond their reach. It was because they had listened to those who had contradicted him, that God says to Moses, "How long will this people provoke me? How long will it be ere they believe me?"

Our first parents believed God, until the Serpent came and contradicted him, saying, "Ye shall not surely die." As soon as they listened to, and believed in this declaration of the arch deceiver,

they could not believe what God had spoken. So it is with multitudes in every age; they begin to listen to those who contradict the sayings of the Most High, and then they of course disbelieve what he has said. But if mankind disbelieve what God has said in consequence of listening to those who contradict him, they are certainly criminal for their unbelief. They ought not to listen to those who contradict what God has said. They know, or may know from his word, what he has said, and knowing this, they act a very unwise and criminal part to listen to those who contradict him.

6. Individuals are sometimes led to disbelieve what God has spoken, in consequence of not humbly seeking the guidance of the Holy Spirit in their researches after truth. "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, who giveth to all men liberally and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him," is the direction and the promise given to all who are desirous of knowing the truth. One means of coming to a knowledge of the truth,—a means which God himself has appointed, and which he delights to bless, is, seeking the guidance of his Spirit. But there are many who never ask with a humble, believing reliance upon God, for his direction in their researches after truth. They investigate every subject which comes before them, with a proud dependence upon the strength of their own understandings. Now, although God has made the truth plain to those who seek after it in his own appointed way; yet he has not made it so to those, who are under the influence of pride and self-sufficiency, and who seek after it, with a reliance upon their

own unassisted reason. They may and do mistake. But as they are criminal for not seeking divine assistance, they must be criminal also for that unbelief which this assistance might have prevented.

The reason, then, why God censures unbelief, is plain: It is the result of improper affections or conduct. It does not arise, as is often pretended, from the want of evidence, but implies the neglect or abuse of the means of obtaining evidence, or a wilful resistance of its light when it cannot be wholly obscured. It is a species of dishonesty with God. The subjects of it do practically contradict his assertions, and renounce him as an object of their confidence. To say that this is criminal, is to tell but half the truth: It is also dangerous. It prevents the reception of the most important blessings which the gospel offers, and draws upon its unhappy subjects, the worst of evils which either the law or gospel threatens. A.

For the Christian Magazine.

A FAITHFUL EXHIBITION OF THE GOSPEL, THE OCCASION OF DIVISIONS AMONG MEN.

THE gospel may be said to be faithfully exhibited, when all its doctrines are clearly, connectedly and fully preached; and when all its duties, with the obligations of men to perform them, and the consequences of performing and of neglecting to perform them, are clearly stated. The gospel is, in its own nature, a pure, peaceable and benevolent system. In its genuine tendency, it is suited to reconcile men to God and to one another. If all men were consistent Christians, peace on earth would be universal. Still, how-

ever, it is to be expected that the faithful exhibition of it will be the occasion of divisions among men.

1. From the fact, that the natural heart of man is strongly opposed to its doctrines and duties. The gospel represents men to be, by nature, guilty, condemned and ruined creatures; destitute of holiness, and possessed of hearts deceitful above all things and desperately wicked. It strikes at the root of all their pride and selfishness; and informs them, that they cannot merit the favour of God, against whom they have rebelled. It throws them into his hands, and represents him as angry with them every day. It gives him the throne of the universe, and declares that he works all things after the counsel of his own will, and that he has mercy on whom he will have mercy. It informs them that it is indispensably necessary for them to be born, not of the will of man, but of God, in order to be qualified for heaven, and admitted to its enjoyments. The gospel requires men to love God with all their hearts, and to act with a supreme and constant reference to his glory. It enjoins upon them repentance towards God, and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, as the condition of forgiveness and salvation, and expressly informs them, that except they repent they shall perish; and except they believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, they shall be damned. To these doctrines and duties, and to others implied in them, the natural hearts of men must, from the nature of the case, feel strong opposition. It is, then, to be expected, that a faithful exhibition of the gospel will be the occasion of divisions among men. Its enemies will manifest their opposition to its doctrines and duties by opposing those by whom

they are faithfully preached and cordially embraced.

2. From numerous passages in the volume of inspiration. "I am come, said our Saviour, to send fire on the earth, and what will I if it be already kindled? Suppose ye, that I am come to give peace on earth? I tell you, nay; but rather division. For, from henceforth, there shall be five in one house, divided, three against two, and two against three. The father shall be divided against the son, and the son against the father; the mother against the daughter, and the daughter against the mother; the mother-in-law against the daughter-in-law, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law." On other occasions he said, "Beware of men, for they will deliver you up to councils and they will scourge you in their synagogues, and ye shall be brought before governors and kings for my sake. And the brother shall deliver up the brother to death, and the father the child, and the children shall rise up against their parents and cause them to be put to death. And ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake. If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his household. Blessed are ye, when men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you from their company, and shall reproach you, and shall cast out your name as evil, for the Son of man's sake. If the world hate you, ye know that it hated me before it hated you. If ye were of the world, the world would love its own, but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore, the world hateth you." Who that considers these and similar passages, can

doubt whether a faithful exhibition of the gospel will be the occasion of divisions among men?

3. From the fact that a faithful exhibition of the gospel always has, in a greater, or less degree, been the occasion of divisions. It was so when the gospel was preached by Christ himself. "In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, if any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink. Many of the people, therefore, when they heard this saying, said, of a truth, this is the Prophet. Others said, this is the Christ. But some said, shall Christ come out of Galilee? And there was a division among the people because of him." While some of the Pharisees said, this man is not of God, others asked, how can a man that is a sinner do such miracles? "And there was a division among them." The common people heard Christ gladly, while the Pharisees and other great men of the Jewish nation, treated both him and his doctrines with contempt. A faithful exhibition of his gospel did not cease to produce divisions among men after his ascension to heaven. By the preaching of Paul and Barnabas at Antioch, many of the Jews, religious proselytes and Gentiles, were brought to embrace the gospel. "But the unbelieving Jews stirred up the devout and honourable women and chief men of the city against Paul and Barnabas and expelled them out of their coasts. When they preached at Iconium a great multitude both of the Jews and Greeks believed; but the unbelieving Jews stirred up the Gentiles and made their minds evil affected towards the brethren. *The multitude of the city was divided, and part held with the Jews and part with the Apostles.* Simi-

lar divisions were produced by the preaching of the gospel at Thessalonica and at Athens, and in every place where it was then preached. After the death of the Apostles, divisions continued. The same cause produced the same effects wherever it operated. The arm of civil power was soon raised against the Christian Church. In the course of a few centuries, thousands and thousands of Christians suffered the cruelties and tortures of a malicious and ferocious persecution. From that period down to the present day, a faithful exhibition of the great truths and duties of Christianity has not failed to produce divisions among men. Here, I might advert to Luther and his colleagues at the time of the reformation in the sixteenth century. Through their instrumentality a broad line of distinction was made between the friends and the enemies of truth. Wherever the gospel is faithfully preached in the time in which we live, divisions are created to a greater or less extent. By some, divine truth is gladly heard and cordially received; by others, it is heard with disgust and rejected. It becomes the occasion of animosity and contention on the part of those by whom it is not believed. But the thing which has been, is that which shall be, and that which is done, is that which shall be done. From the fact, that a faithful exhibition of the gospel ever has been the occasion of divisions among men, we may, with great certainty, infer, that it will continue to be the occasion of them.

If the proposition which I have endeavoured to establish be true, we see in what estimation that kind of preaching is to be held, against which no opposition of heart is excited. That there is

such a kind of preaching prevalent, at the present day, is an undeniable fact. It disrobes the Saviour of his divinity, does not admit his sufferings and death to be a proper sacrifice for sin, overlooks the entire depravity of the unsanctified heart, rejects the doctrine of regeneration by the Holy Spirit, rings perpetual changes on the beauty of virtue and charity, implies that nearly all persons are real Christians, and seldom says any thing respecting the punishment of the wicked in a future state. Against such preaching, it is well known, that no opposition of heart is excited. And why should there be, since it accords with the feelings of the unsanctified heart? But in what estimation is such kind of preaching to be held? Is it not to be regarded as essentially unlike that of the Prophets, of Christ, and of his Apostles? Did not their preaching meet with violent opposition, and occasion divisions among men? If Christ were again to appear and should preach the same doctrines and duties which he inculcated while he tabernacled with men, can there be the least doubt what would be the result? Suppose that Paul were to descend to earth and preach all those things which are found in his Epistles? would there not be divisions? Would multitudes be any more reconciled to them dispensed from his lips, than from his pen? It requires no small share of self-denial in a minister, to read without note or comment, some parts of his Epistles, to many congregations in the nineteenth century. Observe, then, the striking difference between much of the preaching which is desired and is current in some places, and that of

Christ and of his Prophets and Apostles.

The truth of the general proposition suggests the remark, that ministers who faithfully preach the gospel, cannot reasonably expect to escape opposition. The Prophets were hated and opposed on account of the messages of God which they delivered. "Woe is me, my mother," exclaimed Jeremiah, "that thou hast borne me a man of strife and of contention to the whole earth. I have neither lent on usury, nor have men lent me on usury, yet every one of them doth curse me." The Lord Jesus Christ was, also, violently opposed, on account of the doctrines and duties which he preached. And he forewarned his first ministers, that they would be hated and persecuted on the same account. Accordingly we find that they were strongly and constantly opposed, wherever they preached the gospel. With two or three exceptions, they were all put to an ignominious death. Can, then, the faithful minister of the gospel, at the present day, expect to escape opposition? He preaches the same doctrines which were preached by Christ and his Apostles. The hearts of men are the same now as they were in the apostolic age. In the moral, no less than in the natural world, it must be expected, that similar combinations of causes, operating under similar combinations of circumstances, will be productive of similar effects. There is, therefore, no principle on which the faithful minister of the gospel can reasonably found an expectation of escaping opposition. He may not, indeed, be persecuted unto death, by the civil power; but the enemies of the truth will mani-

fest, in some form, their opposition to those by whom it is dispensed.

It is a fact well known, that sinners frequently go from the sanctuary, disturbed with the doctrines of the gospel which they have heard. This is not to be considered as an unfavourable circumstance. So long as sinners are undisturbed by a faithful exhibition of the gospel, it cannot be expected, that the word will be instrumental of their conversion. This can be looked for only, when the word awakens their attention, convinces them of sin, and leads them to inquire what they shall do to be saved. But when these effects are produced, they are disturbed, and are disposed to complain, either of the preacher, or of the sentiments which he advances. Their condition, under such circumstances, is more hopeful than that of those who are never disturbed in their moral slumbers, by a faithful exhibition of divine truth. They will be more likely to search the Scriptures to see whether things are so, and to come to a knowledge of the truth, as it is in Jesus Christ.

It may yet further be remarked, that divisions among men will be occasioned by a faithful exhibition of the gospel, until the Millennium. During that period, which will be at least a thousand years, all will know the Lord, from the least to the greatest, and the people will be all righteous. Until that time, divisions will continue. The grand reason why a faithful exhibition of the gospel now occasions divisions among men, is, because their hearts are naturally opposed to its holy and humbling doctrines and duties. These will, no doubt, continue to be inculcated until

the Millennial day, and there will, until that time, be wicked men in the world. Hence divisions will continue. It is, in itself considered, to be lamented, that any should hate and oppose the truth. But where religious divisions exist, in consequence of a faithful exhibition of the gospel, the blame is to be attached, not to the gospel itself, nor to those by whom it is dispensed, but to those by whom it is opposed. The religious divisions which are so frequently occurring in New England at the present day, are, in many instances, the natural consequence of a faithful exhibition of truth. The existence of them affords evidence, that the truth as it is in Jesus, is in many places, faithfully preached, and that the cause of the Redeemer is yet maintained in this region. Is it not more desirable that religious divisions should be multiplied, than that the gospel should not be faithfully preached, and men, in thick succession, should go undisturbed to endless ruin? F.

From the Christian Observer.

PART IV.

THOUGHTS ON THE SABBATH.

[Continued from page 23.]

ANSWERS TO OBJECTIONS.

WHEN I sat down to communicate my *Thoughts on the Sabbath* to the Christian Observer, my design was to avoid, as much as possible, the appearance of controversy; and merely to state what I conceived to be the doctrine of scripture. But as this subject has been treated at large by a modern author, of high reputation in the learned world, who has shown the great utility of sabbatical institutions, but whose views do not altogether coincide with mine, it

might appear supercilious in me to omit taking particular notice of the arguments which he had adduced to prove that the Sabbath was not instituted till after the departure of the Israelites from Egypt, and remained in force only during the Jewish Dispensation. In my preceding papers, I have not been inattentive to the arguments of this author, and have already, in effect, given a reply to some of them. I now proceed to consider those of which I have hitherto taken no notice, or to which my answers have not been sufficiently explicit.

1. This author candidly acknowledges, that "if the divine command was actually delivered at the creation, it was addressed, no doubt, to the whole human species alike, and continues, unless repealed by some subsequent revelation, binding upon all who come to the knowledge of it."*

It becomes us, then, to weigh, with the utmost caution the words of scripture, respecting the transactions of the *seventh day*, as recorded in the book of Genesis. If this passage declares, that God *then* blessed the seventh day and sanctified it; all debate about the extent of the obligation of a sabbatical institution is precluded.

But it is objected that "the words" (Gen. ii. 3) "do not assert that God then blessed and sanctified the seventh day; but that he blessed and sanctified it *for that reason*;" *because that on it he had rested from all his works, &c.*; "and if any ask, why the Sabbath or sanctification of the seventh day was *then* mentioned, if it was not *then* appointed; the answer is at hand—the order of connexion and not of time, intro-

duced the mention of the Sabbath, in the history of the subject which it was ordained to commemorate."*

I am here at issue with the author whom I have quoted, as, in my apprehension, the words in Genesis do clearly assert, that God *then* blessed and sanctified the seventh day as well as that he sanctified it, *because* that on it he had rested from all his works of creation.

In the first and beginning of the second chapter of Genesis, we have a distinct chronological account of the first seven days, after it had pleased God to begin the stupendous work of creation. The transactions of the seventh day are as distinctly marked as those of any other day, with this difference only, that with respect to the six preceding days, the work is first mentioned and then the day; whereas with respect to the seventh, the day is first mentioned and then its transactions are enumerated.

On the first day, God said, *Let there be light, and there was light.* On the sixth God created man in his own image; and on the seventh day, God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all the work which he had made; and God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it; *because that on it he had rested from all his work which God created and made.* All the transactions enumerated in this passage belong to the seventh day as clearly, in my apprehension, as the creation of man belongs to the sixth; nor can I discover any thing in the passage, except the division into verses, which could mislead a reader of plain understanding. On the seventh day God ended his work and

* Paley's Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy. 8vo. ed. vol. ii. p. 80.

* Paley's Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy. 8vo. ed. vol. ii. p. 76.

rested, and blessed the day, and sanctified it. All these things are mentioned as having taken place on that day. It is as expressly declared that he *then* blessed and sanctified the day, as that he rested on it. I do not know how we can prove any thing from the scriptures, if a passage so plain as this is not to be understood in its obvious sense, unless some subsequent revelation, equally clear, had compelled us to adopt another meaning.

The literal sense of the words is confirmed by the reason which is given for the sanctification of the seventh day. God sanctified the day, *BECAUSE, that in it, he had rested from all his work which God had created and made.* One design of the original institution was to celebrate the work of creation; and when should we expect the celebration to commence? Surely at the time immediately succeeding the transaction to be celebrated. The Almighty has, since the creation, frequently appointed periodical times and significant actions, for the purpose of commemorating signal interpositions of his providence or remarkable mercies vouchsafed to mankind. In all these cases, the celebration was directed to commence from the period of the mercy to be celebrated. The Passover began with the deliverance of the Israelites; and the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, at the death of Christ. But to suppose that an institution, designed to commemorate the creation of the world, had no existence till two thousand years after the event, is so strange in itself, and so contrary to the conduct of God on similar occasions, that the idea cannot be received without a clear warrant from Scripture.

2. "If the Sabbath had been instituted at the time of the creation, as the words in Genesis may seem at first sight to import—it appears unaccountable, that no mention of it, no occasion of even the obscurest allusion to it, should occur either in the general history of the world, before the call of Abraham, which contains, we admit, only a few memoirs of its early ages, and those extremely abridged; or which is more to be wondered at, in that of the lives of the three first *Jewish* patriarchs, which, in many parts of the account is sufficiently circumstantial and domestic."^{*}

If the argument contained in this passage proves any thing, it will prove too much. It will prove, that the observance of the Sabbath ceased during upwards of four hundred years after its institution in the wilderness; for in all that period, we have "no mention of it," nor does "the obscurest allusion to it occur." The history of the settlement of the Jews in Canaan, as related in the book of Joshua, is, in many parts of it, so circumstantial, that one might have expected to find some mention of this important institution. The Israelites marched round the city of Jericho in military array, during seven successive days, (Josh. vi.) one of which must have been the Sabbath; yet no express "permission is recorded to dispense with the institution" during this week. The book of Judges contains a series of revolts from the worship of the true God, and of deliverances from the miseries which these revolts brought upon the Jews. Yet we find in the history no reproof for the contempt of the sabbatical institution,

^{*} Paley's Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy. 8vo ed. vol. ii. p. 75.

though this was a crime particularly marked by the prophets, as a principal cause of the national punishments inflicted on that favoured, yet perverse people.

We argue unfairly, and in a manner injurious to religion, when we oppose the silence of scripture in one part, to its express declarations contained in another. Abraham is particularly commended by the Almighty, for his care in *commanding his children and household to keep the way of the Lord*; and we are certain, that *Abraham rejoiced to see the day of Christ, and he saw it and was glad.* John, viii. 36. Yet where do we find in the Old Testament, the least hint that he communicated this most important branch of knowledge to his family?

The sacrifices under the Mosaic law, were typical of the atoning sacrifice made for our salvation by the death of Christ, and Moses was instructed in the typical nature of the ceremonial law, when he received the commands of God respecting that institution. *The law had a shadow of good things to come.* Heb. x. 1. The service of the tabernacle afforded a figure for the time then present, ch. ix. 9; and the Jewish priests served unto the example and shadow of heavenly things, AS MOSES WAS ADMONISHED OF GOD when he was about to make the tabernacle, ch. viii. 5. Yet where is this chief design of the ceremonial law mentioned in the writings of Moses, though it is explicitly and repeatedly taught in the New-Testament?

The silence of some parts of the scripture respecting the Sabbath, cannot, therefore, with justice, be opposed to the declarations which we find concerning it

in other parts of the word of God.

3. It is objected, that in the 16th chapter of Exodus, where the Sabbath is first mentioned, after the passage in Genesis already quoted, there is not "any intimation that the Sabbath then appointed to be observed, was only the revival of an ancient institution, which had been neglected, forgotten or suspended."*

I wish your readers to examine this chapter with attention, and consider, whether the language, upon the first mention of the Sabbath, is more suitable to an old institution, "neglected or suspended," or to one which was totally unknown. The Israelites having murmured in the wilderness for want of food, God graciously promises them a miraculous supply. *Behold, I will rain bread from heaven for you; and the people shall go out, and gather a certain rate every day, that I may prove them whether they will walk in my law, or no. And it shall come to pass, that on the sixth day they shall prepare that which they bring in; and it shall be twice as much as they gather daily.* Ex. xvi. 4, 5. The people obeyed this injunction, and on the sixth day they gathered twice as much bread: and all the rulers of the congregation came and told Moses. ver. 22. And he said unto them, *this is that which the Lord hath said, To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord.* ver. 23.

Is this language suitable to a solemnity which had never been instituted? As the Ten Commandments had not, at this time, been delivered to the Israelites, the duty of sanctifying the seventh day must have been totally un-

* Paley's Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy. 8vo. ed. vol. ii. p. 76.

known, if no prior command on this subject had existed. Whereas the preparation for the sabbatical rest, the conduct of the rulers of the congregation, and the reply of Moses, appear much more suitable to the revival of a neglected institution, than to the appointment of a new one. We may be sure that, during the oppressive bondage of Egypt, no such rest could have been observed; but the Israelites having now escaped from their oppressors, the institution is revived, and a preparation for its celebration is commanded, before any mention is made of the institution itself. And when that preparation is completed, the Sabbath is mentioned as a solemnity already commanded: *This is that which the Lord hath said, To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord.*

4. "This interpretation," that the Sabbath was first instituted in the wilderness, "is strongly supported by a passage in the prophet Ezekiel, where the Sabbath is plainly spoken of as given, and what else can that mean but as *first instituted in the wilderness?*" Nehemiah also recounts the promulgation of the sabbatical law amongst the transactions in the wilderness.*

The passage in Ezekiel is as follows: *I caused them to go forth out of the land of Egypt, and brought them into the wilderness, and I gave them my statutes, and showed them my judgments, which if a man do, he shall even live in them. Moreover also I gave them my Sabbaths.* Chap. xx. 10, 11.

If this passage proves that the Sabbath was first instituted in the wilderness, it will prove that the other commandments of the mo-

ral law were then first promulgated; for the language respecting all the commandments is precisely the same. "*I gave them my statutes—I also gave them my Sabbaths.*" Yet we are sure that the moral law was made known to mankind before its promulgation at Mount Sinai. The sixth and seventh commandments, for instance, were ordained from the beginning. Genesis ix. 16. Matt. xix. 8. Indeed the whole tenor of the Bible, before the Israelites formed a distinct nation, shows that mankind were not left without the knowledge of God's laws; *for where no law is, there is no transgression.* Rom. iv. 5.

The passage in Nehemiah is of the same import with that in Ezekiel. *Thou camest down also upon Mount Sinai and spakest with them from heaven, and gavest them right judgments, and true laws, good statutes and commandments, and madest known unto them thy holy Sabbath.* As the *true laws* and *good statutes* contained in the ten commandments were not then first given, though they were then proclaimed in a more awful manner, so neither was the Sabbath then first instituted. As far as we can deduce an argument from a similarity of language, this must be the consequence. The expression, *made known*, is used in scripture, where the first intimation of the thing cannot be intended; as *God MADE KNOWN his ways unto Moses, his acts unto the children of Israel*, Ps. ciii. 7; though this was not the first communication of his will, nor manifestation of his acts to mankind.

5. "The Sabbath is described as a sign between God and the people of Israel. Exod. xx. 12, and xxxi. 16, 17. Now it does not seem easy to understand how the Sabbath could be a *sign* be-

* Paley's Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy, 8vo. ed. vol. ii. p. 76.

tween God and the people of Israel, unless the observance of it was peculiar to that people and designed to be so."*

By a *sign*, I understand something that should distinguish the people of God from all the heathen nations by whom they were surrounded. The Jews while they continued obedient, were distinguished by their rest from ordinary labours every seventh day, and their dedication of it to the worship of Jehovah. This would mark them out as a peculiar people, devoted to God's service. But this will not prove, that no obligation lay upon any other people to observe a sabbatical institution. The observance of all God's commandments was to be a *sign*, or *badge*, by which the people of God were to be distinguished from other nations. *Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord; and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. And these words which I command thee this day shall be in thine heart. And thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thine hand.* Deut. vi. 4, &c. That is, thou shalt consider them as a badge or mark of distinction by which the world may know thou art indeed the people of God. But none of the commandments would distinguish them as a people devoted to the service of God, in so peculiar a manner as the fourth. Their disobedience to this command is, therefore, often specified by the Prophets as a special cause of the punishments which God inflicted on that nation.

6. "The distinction of the Sabbath is, in its nature, as much a positive ceremonial institution as

that of many other seasons which were appointed by the Levitical law to be kept holy."*

It is not possible to conceive any duty to be more strictly moral, or of more universal obligation, than that of worshipping Almighty God. And if it is our duty to join in acts of publick and social worship, some fixed time must be appointed for the exercise of this duty. There is, therefore, nothing more of a positive or ceremonial nature in a sabbatical institution, than what arises from the necessity of the case. He, who made us for his own pleasure, is surely the best judge what portion of our time ought to be dedicated to his more immediate worship and service. It does not appertain to us to inquire why the Almighty confined his work of creation to six days; why he rested on the seventh, or why he commanded us to sanctify this portion of our time: but such an institution certainly rests upon different grounds from those festivals, which God commanded the Jews to observe, in commemoration of mercies peculiar to that nation. It requires no great discernment to see the difference between dwelling in booths, at a certain period of the year, to commemorate the protection which the Jewish nation received in the wilderness, and the weekly celebration of the mercies of creation and redemption, which are as extensive as the globe which we inhabit.

Whether the Sabbath should be celebrated on the first or seventh day of the week, is, undoubtedly, a circumstance of a positive nature; but it is a circumstance which does not alter the duties peculiar to the Sab-

* Paley's Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy. 8vo. ed. vol. ii. p. 81.

* Paley's Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy. 8vo. ed. vol. ii. p. 81.

bath. The day on which this institution ought to be observed, might have been, and, I doubt not, actually was altered by the authority of our Saviour, without any alteration in the substance of the commandment.

7. "If the command by which the Sabbath was instituted, be binding on Christians, it must bind as to the day, the duties and the penalty; in none of which it is received."*

The *duties* of the Sabbath are without doubt, essential to the institution; but the *day* is not essential. By the *penalty*, our author, I suppose, means that of death, which was directed to be inflicted on the Sabbath breaker under the Jewish dispensation. But if there be any argument in this assertion, it will prove, that the punishments incurred by a breach of the other commandments of the moral law, ought to be inflicted on offending Christians. It will prove that the idolater, the blasphemer, the adulterer, and the stubborn, rebellious son, as well as the Sabbath breaker, ought to be put to death under the gospel dispensation.

8. "The observance of the Sabbath was not one of the articles enjoined by the Apostles in the 15th chap. of Acts, upon them, *which from the Gentiles were turned unto God.*"*

In addition to the ceremonial pollutions, from which the Gentile Christians were commanded to abstain, the Apostle mentions the crime of *fornication*. But we are incompetent to judge, why the breach of one command only of the moral law is interdicted in this place. Little weight ought surely to be attached to such negative arguments, respecting

the obligation of the fourth commandment of the moral law, since they oppose the positive declaration of our Saviour, that he came not to remove one jot or tittle of this law; which the Apostle Paul also declares was not intended to be made void by faith in Jesus Christ.

Those of your readers, who are unacquainted with the work whence the above quotations are taken, may be ready to conclude, that the author meant to speak disrespectfully of sabbatical institutions, which is by no means the case. He has shown their great utility, and has proved that "the *assembling* upon the first day of the week for the purpose of public worship and religious instruction, is a law of Christianity, of divine appointment." He concludes also, that "the resting on that day from our employments," is a duty "binding on the conscience of every individual, in a country in which a weekly Sabbath is established."*

The most careful consideration, which I have been able to give this subject, has produced a firm persuasion in my mind, that the obligation to this duty is of universal extent; and this seems to have been the view which the primitive Christians had of the subject, as appears from a quotation which our author has made from the works of Irenæus. *Unusquisque nostrum Sabbatizat spiritualiter, meditatione legis gaudens, opificium Dei admirans. Each of us spends the Sabbath in a spiritual manner, meditating on the law of God with delight, and contemplating his workmanship with admiration.*

Let it be remembered that Irenæus had been instructed by Polycarp, who was the disciple of

* Paley's Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy. 8vo. ed. vol. ii. p. 82.

† *Ib.* 81.

* Paley's Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy. 8vo. ed. vol. ii. p. 86.

the Apostle John;* that in this passage he is not describing any doctrine or practice peculiar to himself, but the general conduct of Christians; that he appropriates the title of *Sabbath* to that day which was set apart for religious exercises, and which was undoubtedly the first day of the week; that the manner of spending this day by the early Christians, corresponds with the description of the Sabbath given by Isaiah; that what the Jewish prophet commanded, the Christians practised; and can any reasonable doubt remain that the Christian church had been instructed by the Apostles and their immediate successors, to sanctify the first day of the week *as a Sabbath unto the Lord*? A more direct historical testimony of this important fact need not be required.

W. H.

* Thus Irenæus speaks, "I can describe the very spot in which Polycarp sat and expounded, and the sermons which he preached to the multitude, and how he related to us his converse with John, and with the rest of those who had seen the Lord; how he mentioned their particular expressions, and what things he had heard from them of the Lord, and of his miracles, and of his doctrines. As Polycarp had received from the eye-witnesses of the word of life, he told us all things agreeable to the Scriptures. Milner's Ecclesiastical Hist. vol. i. p. 312. 2d ed. Life of Irenæus.

DECEPTION OR HYPOCRISY IN DEATH.

Messrs. Editors,—I wish you, or some of your correspondents would warn the public against a dangerous impression, which seems to have been too generally received, that all which is said by a dying man is to be received as truth. That mankind are generally sincere in their declarations at death, is doubtless true. But their sincerity, it is to be considered, does not, even at this hour, secure them from deception. If they have been sincere in a false opinion through life, it

is to be expected, that they will sincerely retain it, at death. There is seldom any new light reflected upon the understanding, at this late and dark hour.

Nor is it altogether incredible that the same self-imposition or hypocrisy, which some people practise upon themselves and others through life, should be attempted at death. Will it be said, that at this solemn hour, they can have no motives to deception? True, it would seem so. But the fact may be different from what we should, at first view, suspect. Is that heart, which has resisted through life, the most powerful motives to honesty and fair dealing, with itself, and with others, and yielded to the paltry considerations which have tempted it to deception, to be trusted in death? May not the same love of error, the same pride of opinion, the same propensity to self-justification, and the same desire to be thought consistent and firm, which are among the most prominent features of human nature, retain their influence over men as long as reason continues, and lead them at death to declare their belief in opinions which they have avowed merely for convenience's sake, and their innocence in regard to actions of which they are verily guilty? "Rosseau, the hardened villany of whose life is almost without a parallel in modern times, and who seems to have assumed the mask of virtue for no other purpose, than that of propagating with more success, the blackest vice, says, in that very work which contains a confession of his crimes, that no man can come to the throne of God, and say, *I am a better man than Rosseau.*" And just before he expired, he observed to his mistress, "Ah! my dear,

how happy a thing it is to die, when one has no reason for remorse or self-reproach!" Then addressing himself to the Almighty, he said, "Eternal Being! the soul, that I am going to give thee back, is as pure at this moment, as it was when it proceeded from thee; render it the partaker of thy felicity."

undefiled before God and the Father is this: To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world?" DISCIPULUS.

A REQUEST.

Messrs. Editors,—It has become somewhat fashionable in the vicinity of my residence, for religious societies to settle ministers with the understanding, that they shall be dismissed whenever a majority, or two thirds of their people shall desire it; or whenever the ministers themselves shall choose to leave their people; the party desiring the dissolution of the connexion to give the other six months' notice. Now I should be glad to have your opinion in regard to the expediency of this practice. A READER.

A QUESTION.

Messrs. Editors,—I have often heard from the pulpit, and read in the works of respectable divines, that true religion consists in disinterested love to God and man. Will you, or some of your correspondents inform me through the medium of the Christian Magazine, how this definition of religion is consistent with the words of James,—"Pure religion and

Missionary Intelligence.

From the Missionary Herald.

A BRIEF VIEW OF THE MISSIONS UNDER THE DIRECTION OF SOCIETIES IN THE UNITED STATES.

I. AMERICAN BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS.

MISSIONS at BOMBAY—in CEYLON—among the CHEROKEES, the CHOC-TAWS, and the CHEROKEES-OF-THE-ARKANSAS—at the SANDWICH ISLANDS—MALTA—in SYRIA—in PALESTINE—and at BUENOS AYRES. Measures have also been taken to ascertain the religious and moral state of CHILI, PERU, and COLOMBIA.

BOMBAY.

About 1,300 miles, travelling distance, west of Calcutta. Population of the island about 200,000. Commenced in 1813. Stations at Bombay, Mahim, and Tannah.

Bombay.—A large city on an island of the same name. Rev. Gordon Hall, and Rev. Edmund

Frost, *Missionaries*, James Garrett, *Printer*; and their wives.

Mahim.—Six miles from Bombay, on the north part of the island. Rev. Allen Graves, *Missionary*, and Mrs. Graves.

Tannah.—The chief town on the island of Salsette, 25 miles from Bombay. Mrs. Elisabeth

Nichols, widow of the Rev. John Nichols, who died Dec. 9, 1824.

CEYLON.

A large island in the Indian sea, separated from the coast of Coromandel by a channel, called the Straits of Manaar. Length 300 miles, breadth 200. Population 1,500,000. Commenced in 1816. Stations at Tillipally, Batticotta, Oodooville, Panditeripo, and Manepy.

Tillipally.—Nine miles north of Jaffnapatam. Rev. Henry Woodward, *Missionary*; and Mrs. Woodward. Nicholas Permander, *Native Preacher*.

Batticotta.—Six miles north-west of Jaffnapatam. Rev. Benjamin C. Meigs, *Missionary*, Rev. Daniel Poor, *Missionary and Principal of the Central School*; and their wives. Gabriel Tissera, *Native Preacher*.

Oodooville.—Five miles north of Jaffnapatam. Rev. Miron Winslow, *Missionary*; and Mrs. Winslow. George Koch, *Native Medical Assistant*.

Panditeripo.—Nine miles north-west of Jaffnapatam. Rev. John Scudder, M. D. *Missionary and Physician*; and Mrs. Scudder.

Manepy.—Four miles and an half north-west of Jaffnapatam. Rev. Levi Spaulding, *Missionary*; and Mrs. Spaulding.

The number of native children boarding in the families of the missionaries, is 155. The number of natives belonging to the church is 73. The number of native free schools is 59. The number of boys in these schools, is 2,414, and that of girls, 255; total 2,669. Two revivals of religion were experienced during the year 1824; and 41 natives, the first fruits of the first revival, were admitted to the church.

THE CHEROKEES.

A tribe of Indians inhabiting a tract of country included within the chartered limits of the States of Georgia, Alabama, Tennessee, and North Carolina. Population about 15,000. Commenced in 1817. Stations at Brainerd, Creek Path, Carmel, Hightower, Willstown, Haweis, and Candy's Creek.

Brainerd.—Within the chartered limits of Tennessee, 240 miles N. W. of Augusta, and 150 S. E. of Nashville. Rev. Samuel A. Worcester, *Missionary*, John C. Elsworth, *Teacher and Superintendent of Secular Concerns*, Henry Parker, and John Vail, *Farmers*, Ainsworth E. Blunt, *Farmer and Mechanic*; and their wives; Josiah Hemmingway, *Farmer*; Sophia Sawyer, *Teacher*.

Carmel.—Sixty miles S. E. of Brainerd, within the chartered limits of Georgia. Moody Hall, *Teacher*, and Mrs. Hall; William Hubbard Manwaring, *Farmer*.

Creek Path.—One hundred miles W. S. W. of Brainerd, within the chartered limits of Alabama. Rev. William Potter, *Missionary*, Dr. Elizur Butler, *Teacher*, Fenner Bosworth, *Farmer*; and their wives; Ermina Nash.

Hightower.—Eighty miles S. S. E. of Brainerd. Isaac Proctor, *Teacher*, and Mrs. Proctor.

Willstown.—About 50 miles S. W. of Brainerd, just within the chartered limits of Alabama. Rev. Ard Hoyt, Rev. William Chamberlain, *Missionaries*; and their wives; Rev. Daniel S. Buttrick, *Missionary*, Sylvester Ellis, *Farmer*; and Mrs. Ellis.

Haweis.—About 55 miles W. of S. from Brainerd, within the chartered limits of Georgia. Frederick Elsworth, *Teacher and Farmer*; and Mrs. Elsworth.

Candy's Creek.—About 25 miles N. E. of Brainerd, within the chartered limits of Tennessee. William Holland, *Teacher and Farmer*; and Mrs. Holland.

Mr. and Mrs. Dean have been obliged to leave Brainerd and come to the north, on account of Mrs. Dean's declining health.

THE CHOCTAWS.

A tribe of Indians, residing between the Tombigbee and Mississippi rivers, almost wholly within the chartered limits of Mississippi. Population about 20,000. Commenced in 1818. Stations at Elliot, Mayhew, Bethel, Emmaus, Goshen, Ikhunnuh, and at three other places not yet named. All these stations are within the chartered limits of Mississippi.

WESTERN DISTRICT.

Elliot.—Situated on the Yalo Busha Creek; 400 miles W. S. W. of Brainerd. John Smith, *Farmer and Superintendent of Secular Concerns*, Joel Wood, *Teacher*, and their wives; Zechariah Howes, *Farmer and Mechanic*, Anson Dyer, *Catechist*, and Lucy Hutchinson.

Bethel.—About 60 miles S. E. of Elliot, and the same distance S. W. of Mayhew. Stephen B. Macomber, *Teacher*, and Mrs. Macomber; Philena Thatcher.

Capt. Harrison's.—Near Pearl river, more than 100 miles south-easterly from Elliot. Anson Gleason, *Teacher*.

NORTH-EAST DISTRICT.

Mayhew.—Ninety miles E. of Elliot. Rev. Cyrus Kingsbury, *Missionary and Superintendent of the Choctaw Mission*, Dr. William W. Pride, *Physician*, Calvin Cushman, *Farmer*; and their wives; William Hooper, *Teacher*; Anna Burnham, *Teacher*.

Mooshoolatubbee's.—About 20

miles from Mayhew, in a south-easterly direction. Adin C. Gibbs, *Teacher*.

I-ik-hun-nuh.—A settlement about 30 miles W. of Mayhew. Rev. Cyrus Byington, *Missionary*, David Wright, *Teacher*, and Mrs. Wright; Mrs. Moseley.

SOUTH-EAST DISTRICT.

Emmaus.—About 140 miles, in a south-easterly direction from Mayhew. Moses Jewell, *Mechanic*, David Gage, *Teacher*; and their wives.

Mr. Juzon's.—About 100 miles south-easterly from Mayhew. O-rasmus L. Nash, *Teacher*.

Goshen.—About 115 miles S. by West from Mayhew. Rev. Alfred Wright, *Missionary*, Elijah Bardwell, *Teacher*; and their wives; Ebenezer Bliss, *Farmer*; Eliza Buer.

Within the past year the mission has experienced a severe loss in the death of Mrs. Hooper. She died June 4th, in a very happy state of mind.

THE CHEROKEES OF THE ARKANSAS.

Cherokees, who, from the year 1804 to the present time, have removed from their residence E. of the Mississippi, to a tract of country on the N. bank of the Arkansas river. Population about 5,000. Commenced in 1820.

Dwight.—The only station, is situated on the west side of Illinois creek; four miles north of the Arkansas river; 500 miles from the junction of the Arkansas with the Mississippi, following the course of the river; and about 200 miles in a direct line from its mouth. Rev. Alfred Finney and Rev. Cephas Washburn, *Missionaries*, George L. Weed, M. D. *Teacher and Physician*, Jacob Hitchcock, *Steward*, James Orr,

Farmer, Samuel Wisner and Asa Hitchcock, *Mechanics*; and their wives; Ellen Stetson, *Teacher*; Cynthia Thrall.

The school for boys, and the school for girls have made very encouraging progress. The children are contented, and their parents are satisfied. Nearly one fourth of the pupils were so far advanced, as to have commenced the study of geography about a year since. Many read the scriptures intelligibly. The pupils, in general, are docile in their dispositions, quick in their apprehension, prompt in obedience, active in their sports, and diligent in their studies.—These children were, but a little while ago, wandering in the forest, totally without mental or moral cultivation.

THE SANDWICH ISLANDS.

A group of islands in the Pacific ocean—extended in a direction W. N. W. and E. S. E. The estimated length, breadth, and superficial contents, of each island, are as follows:

	Length.	Breadth.	Square miles.
Hawaii,	97 miles,	78	4,000
Maui,	48	29	600
Tahurawa,	11	8	60
Ranai,	17	9	100
Morokai,	40	7	170
Oahu,	46	23	520
Tauai,	28	32	520
Niihau,	20	7	30
Taura, } Little more than barren			
Morokini, } rocks.			

Established in 1820. Stations on *Oahu*, at Honoruru; on *Tauai*, at Waimea; on *Maui*, at Lahaina; on *Hawaii*, at Kairua, Waiakea, and Kaavaroa.

OAHU.

Honoruru.—Rev. Hiram Bingham, *Missionary*, Elisha Loomis *Printer*, Abraham Blatchley, M. D. *Physician*; and their wives; Levi Chamberlain, *Superintendent of Secular Concerns*.

TAUAI.

Waimea.—Samuel Whitney, *Licensed Preacher and Missionary*, and Mrs. Whitney; George Sandwich, *Native Assistant*.

MAUI.

Lahaina.—Rev. William Richards, and Rev. Charles Samuel Stewart, *Missionaries*, and their wives; Betsey Stockton, colored woman, *Domestic Assistant*.

HAWAII.

Kairua.—Rev. Asa Thurston, and Rev. Artemas Bishop, *Missionaries*, and their wives; John Honorii, *Native Assistant*.

Waiakea.—Joseph Goodrich, *Licensed Preacher and Missionary*, Samuel Ruggles, *Teacher*; and their wives.

Kaavaroa.—James Ely, *Licensed Preacher and Missionary*, and Mrs. Ely. Thomas Hopu, *Native Assistant*.

Eight churches have been erected for the public worship of the true God, principally by the native chiefs. In some of them large congregations assemble.

The schools flourish. *Fifty* natives, who have been taught to read and write by the missionaries, were, at the latest dates, employed as school-masters. Between *two and three thousand* individuals, of both sexes, and all ages and ranks, were receiving regular instruction in the schools.

MALTA.

An island in the Mediterranean, 20 miles long, and 12 broad. It is about 50 miles from Sicily. On this island, anciently called Melita, the Apostle Paul was shipwrecked, while on his way to Rome. Commenced in 1821. Rev. Daniel Temple, *Missionary*, and Mrs. Temple.

SYRIA.

Syria is said, by writers on geography, to be bounded, S. E. and

S. by the desert of Arabia, and W. by the Mediterranean. Its north eastern and eastern limits are not well defined. In this larger sense it includes Palestine. It seems proper, however, that these two interesting tracts of country should be considered as separate and distinct. The only station in Syria is at

Beyroot.—A sea-port town at the foot of Mount Lebanon. Population not less than 5,000. Rev. William Goodell, and Rev. Isaac Bird, *Missionaries*, and their wives.

PALESTINE, OR THE HOLY LAND.

Including all the territory anciently possessed by the Israelites.

Jerusalem.—The capital of Palestine. Population estimated at from 15,000 to 20,000. Rev. Pliny Fisk, and Rev. Jonas King, *Missionaries*.

BUENOS AYRES.

One of the South American Republics. Rev. Theophilus Parvin, *Missionary*.

Mr. Parvin has established an Academy in Buenos Ayres, containing about 70 scholars—some of them children of men of high rank. The Bible is one of the reading books.

In September, a bill passed the Legislature declaring, that the

right which man has to worship God according to his conscience, is inviolable in that Province.

CHILI, PERU, AND COLOMBIA.

Republics in South America. Rev. John C. Brigham, *Travelling Agent*.

Mr. Brigham sailed from Boston, in company with Mr. Parvin, July 25, 1823. It is expected he will return to the United States during the present year.

FOREIGN MISSION SCHOOL.

Situated in Cornwall, Conn. Established in 1816. Rev. Amos Basset, D. D. *Principal*.

About 60 heathen youths, from various nations, have, at different times, been members of this school. A large proportion of these youths, became hopefully pious, while members of the school. The present number of scholars is 14.

SUMMARY.

Whole number of Preachers of the Gospel from this country,	34
Native Preachers and Interpreters,	6
Laborers from this country, including missionaries, and male assistants,	73
Females, including the wives of the missionaries,	69—148
Stations,	35
Churches organized,	13
Schools,	about 150
Pupils,	about 7,500

[To be continued.]

Ordinations and Installations.

December 1,—Rev. BENJAMIN F. STAUNTON was ordained over the Congregational Church in Bethlem, Con. Sermon by the Rev. Mr. Griswold of Watertown.

December 6,—Rev. JOHN CHAMBERS was ordained at New-Haven, Con. to the work of the Ministry. Sermon by Prof. Fitch, of Yale College.

Jan. 4,—Rev. CHARLES FITCH was installed Pastor of the Church in Holliston, Mass. Rev. David Long, of Milford, made the introductory prayer; Rev. B. B. Wisner, of Boston, preached the sermon; Rev. Nathaniel Howe, of Hopkinton, made the installing prayer; Rev. Dr. Saunders, of Medfield, gave the charge; Rev.

Mr. Ide, of Medway, gave the right hand of fellowship; Rev. Mr. Noyes, of Needham, made an address to the people; and Rev. Mr. Wood, of Upton, made the concluding prayer.—*Communicated.*

Jan. 4,—Rev. HARLEY GOODWIN was ordained in New-Marlbrough, North Parish, as Colleague Pastor with Rev. Dr. Catlin. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Yale, of New-Hartford, Con.

Jan. 6,—Rev. ROYAL WASHBURN was installed Pastor of the First Church in Amherst, Mass. Sermon by Rev. Prof. Stuart.

Jan. 11,—Rev. JOSHUA BARRET was ordained Pastor of the Second Congregational Church in

Plymouth, Mass. Sermon by Rev. Enoch Pratt, of Barnstable.

Jan. 13,—Rev. ERASTUS MALTBY was installed Pastor of the Trinitarian Church in Taunton, Mass.; and on the same occasion Rev. GEORGE COWLES was ordained as an Evangelist. Introductory prayer by Rev. Luther Sheldon, of Easton; sermon by Rev. B. B. Wisner, of Boston; consecrating prayer by Rev. Elisha Fish, of Wrentham; charge by Rev. Thomas Andros, of Berkley; right hand of fellowship by Rev. Daniel Huntington, of North Bridgewater, and the concluding prayer by Rev. Calvin Hitchcock, of Randolph.—*Communicated.*

Poetry.

From the Tract Magazine.

IMPORTANT PRECEPTS.

Whatever else your mind pursues—
To comfort, edify, amuse,
And save from error—daily choose

“TO SEARCH THE SCRIPTURES.” *John v. 39. 2 Tim. iii. 15, 16.*

In every state temptations rise:
Delusive arts the Serpent tries.—
Hark! Wisdom's voice distinctly cries,

“BE EVER WATCHFUL.” *Mat. xxiv. 42. Eph. v. 15.*

Would you o'er sin the conquest gain,
And to the Saviour's love attain,
Nor let a hostile thought remain;

“LIVE MUCH IN PRAYER.” *Luke xviii. 1. 1 Thes. v. 17.*

Should worldly prospects, vast and fair,
Or creature love, your heart ensnare;
Deep rooted in your bosom bear

“THE THOUGHTS OF DYING.” *Heb. ix. 27. 1 Cor. vii. 29, 30, 31.*

Ye Pilgrims, passing tow'rd your home—
Ye mortals, verging to the tomb,
Not knowing when your Lord may come;

“BE ALWAYS READY.” *Heb. xi. 13, 14. Mat. xxiv. 44 & xxv. 10*

Subscriptions and Payments for the Christian Magazine, received by the following gentlemen :

<i>Boston.</i>	<i>Sandwich.</i>
T. R. Marvin, <i>Congress-street.</i>	Rev. David L. Hunn.
<i>Franklin.</i>	<i>Plympton.</i>
Rev. Nathaniel Emmons, D. D.	Rev. Elijah Dexter.
<i>Wrentham.</i>	<i>Carver.</i>
Rev. Elisha Fisk,	Rev. Luther Wright.
Rev. Moses Thatcher.	<i>Uxbridge.</i>
<i>Medway.</i>	Rev. Samuel Judson.
Rev. Jacob Ide,	<i>Ward.</i>
Rev. Luther Bailey.	Rev. Enoch Pond.
<i>Attleborough.</i>	<i>Harvard.</i>
Rev. John Ferguson,	Rev. George Fisher.
Mr. Samuel Tyler.	<i>Foxborough.</i>
<i>Hopkinton.</i>	Rev. Willard Pierce.
Rev. Nathaniel Howe.	<i>Plymouth.</i>
<i>Newburyport.</i>	Mr. John Harlow.
Mr. Charles Whipple.	<i>Fitchburgh.</i>
<i>Andover.</i>	Rev. Mr. Putnam.
Mr. Henry C. Jewett.	<i>Waltham.</i>
<i>Taunton.</i>	Rev. Sewall Harding.
Rev. Alvan Cobb.	<i>Upton.</i>
<i>New-Bedford.</i>	Dea. Daniel Fisk.
Deacon Barker.	<i>Sutton.</i>
<i>Middleborough.</i>	Doctor David March.
Capt. Nathaniel Eddy.	<i>Seekonk.</i>
<i>Abington.</i>	Dea. Elihu Carpenter.
Rev. Samuel W. Colburn,	<i>Ashford, Conn.</i>
Rev. Samuel Spring.	Rev. Reuben Torrey.
<i>Weymouth.</i>	<i>New-York City.</i>
Rev. William Tyler.	Mr. Lowell Holbrook, <i>Merchant.</i>
<i>Randolph.</i>	<i>Providence, R. I.</i>
Rev. David Brigham.	Mr. Samuel Billings, <i>No. 35 South</i>
<i>Wareham.</i>	<i>Main Street.</i>
Rev. Mr. Hemenway.	

N. B. Subscribers are desired to give information to the Printer, in what way they wish to have their Magazines sent to them, if they are not accommodated with the present arrangement.